



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	۱O.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/646,075 08/22/2003		08/22/2003	Vijaya Juturu	NUTRI.027A	9604
20995	75	90 04/14/2005		EXAMINER	
		ARTENS OLSON &	HENLEY III, RAYMOND J		
2040 MA FOURTE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
IRVINE,	CA	92614	1614		
			DATE MAILED: 04/14/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/646,075	JUTURU ET AL.		
		_	
Examiner	Art Unit		

Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Raymond J. Henley III	1614					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 08 April 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.					
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or o this application, applicant must timely file one of the folloplaces the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comp following time periods: 	n the same day as filing a Notice o owing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in liance with 37 CFR 1.114. The repl	f Appeal. To avoid at ffidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 (ence, which CFR 41.31; or				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no							
event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later th Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o . ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FI).	f the final rejection. RST REPLY WAS FILE	D WITHIN TWO				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened sta above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	n fee under 37 as set forth in (b)				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com	pliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	e filed within two mon	ths of the date				
of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be	extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e))), to avoid dismissal o	of the appeal.				
AMENDMENTS 2. The proposed emondment(s) filed after a final rejection	but prior to the date of filing a brief	f will not be entered l	hecause				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); 							
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re	educing or simplifying	the issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		jected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	121. See attached Notice of Non-Co	ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s							
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s). 		-	,				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ill be entered and an	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> .	•						
Claim(s) objected to: <u>70</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>32-35 and 69</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	ut before or on the date of filing a N nd sufficient reasons why the affida	Notice of Appeal will <u>r</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	ince because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)					
13.		Raymond J Henley					
		Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1614					

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 4-05)

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons of record.

In particular, the Examiner has interpreted the claimed expression "treating a disease secondary to coronary vascular disease" in a broad and reasonable manner as indicated by MPEP 2111 such that it would include the treatment situation of the prior art where atherosclerosis is treated and it is concluded that diseases secondary to atherosclerosis would also be treated, i.e., "treated" in the sense that the risk of occurence of diseases secondary to atherosclerosis, i.e., a coronary vascular disease, would be effectively reduced.

With respect to the treatment of nephrosclerosis, Applicants urge that it would not have been obvious to "treat" this disease because it does not necessarily involve hypertension. It appears as though Applicants would want the Examiner to interpret the claims as if they recited a particular type of "treatment", i.e., a treatment that is in a normotensive patient or else is a treatment that somehow excludes the treatment advanced by the Examiner. The claims simply read "treating" and thus the Examiner is free is interpret this term in a broad and reasonable manner.

Should Applicants wish the Examiner to interpret the claims in a particular manner such that the treatment scenario of the prior art is not encompassed by the claim terminology, then Applicants should amend the claims to particularly point out a treatment method that is not taught or suggested by the prior art.

Applicants have not point out why the Examiner's interpretation is not proper, i.e., broad/reasonable, and thus the rejection is maintained.